

2007 Update to the EOC Funding Model

Authority

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) bears statutory responsibility to, among other tasks,

- (2) make programmatic and funding recommendations to the General Assembly;
- (3) report annually to the General Assembly, State Board of Education, and the public on the progress of the programs;
- (4) recommend Education Accountability Act and EIA program changes to state agencies and other entities as it considers necessary. (SC Code of Laws 1976, as amended, §59-6-10)

and the statutes further require the EOC's Division of Accountability to

- (3) monitor and evaluate the functioning of the public education system and its components, programs, policies, and practices and report annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the commission no later than February first of each year (SC Code of Laws 1976, as amended, §59-6-110).

Background

In December of 2003 the staff of the EOC at the request of the committee proposed a revised funding model for public education. The model was developed to respond to five questions:

1. What is the educational program mandated in statute or regulation?
2. What is the cost of the educational program in an average school district or school?
3. Are there ways to spend our public dollars which foster higher achievement?
4. What dollars are in the public domain dedicated to schools and districts?
5. What is the state-district balance in educational spending?

First, the model enumerates all state laws and regulations under which public schools operate. The cost of providing the services mandated by these laws and regulations are calculated. Also included are funds for research-based, effective program practices. All teacher salaries in the model are based upon an average teacher salary of \$300 above the Southeastern average teacher salary. Unless otherwise noted, the salaries for all other professional staff are those annually published by Educational Research Service. These professional salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West

Virginia. And, finally, the model utilizes the most recent In\$ite data for current expenditures in operations, materials, etc., in South Carolina's public schools.

The key component of the model is a revised base student cost. The base student cost is defined as the cost of providing a mandated, standards-based educational program to all children in grades kindergarten through twelve. The base student cost reflects the cost of an educational program in an "average" school district or school. The base student cost is premised on specific district and school enrollments which in 2003 reflected the following mean enrollments for schools and districts in South Carolina.

District Enrollment	7,500
Elementary School	500
Middle School	750
High School	900

The overriding component of the base student cost is the cost of teacher salaries and related fringe benefits. The model proposed by the EOC incorporates a pupil teacher ratio of 21:1 in **all** grades. Effective research on class size supports the lower size ratios. Additional teachers are funded through the special education weights to lower class size for special needs children. And, to lower class sizes even more, districts may opt to use funds generated through a poverty weighting or remediation weighting to provide intensive intervention for these students. Not included in the base student cost is the cost of providing foreign language and related arts classes. In 2003 the base student cost was initially projected at \$5,239.

Each year the EOC has updated the base student cost to reflect changes in salaries, inflationary increases, and state law. This year the EOC staff has again updated the base student cost. As the following table shows, the base student cost declined in 2006 from \$5,657 to \$5,311; however, the total number of weighted pupil units funded increased for a net increase in funding. (The appendix includes the supporting documents that reflect the 2007 updates.)

The 2007 base student cost is adjusted to \$5,606. For the first time since 2003, the greatest variation between the base student cost of an elementary, middle and high school was only two percent. Consequently, to simplify the formula even more, the district cost of \$1,705 was added to the highest school cost, \$3,901, the cost of educating a high school student, to yield a base student cost of \$5,606 for students in grades K through 12. All general education weights for kindergarten through grade 12 were then adjusted to 1.0.

Year	Base Student Cost	Total WPUs ¹
2003	\$5,239	825,971
2004	\$5,347	839,493
2005	\$5,657	836,837
2006	\$5,311	905,923
2007	\$5,606	911,020

¹ Rounded to the nearest whole number.

The EOC model, as proposed in 2003 and as updated in 2007, incorporates three levels of weights. The weights provide incremental increases in funds above the base student cost to provide additional funds beyond the general education components. The EOC proposed three categories of weights in 2006 which account for the increase in the weighted pupil units. These categories are:

1. General educational program for each student which is essentially the base student cost for “average” students in grades K through 12 with weights that exceed 1.0 for students with disabilities and students in vocational education. The staff has not recommended amending the weights for students with disabilities. The weight for students on homebound instruction was changed to 1.0. Each student enrolled in public schools would receive one of these general educational weights.
2. Compensatory weights address the contexts or factors that detract from high achievement over time. These weights are in addition to the general educational program weights. A compensatory weight of 0.20 is included for children in poverty. Poverty is defined as children eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program or eligible for Medicaid. A weight of 0.20 is included for students with limited English proficiency who require intensive English language instruction programs and whose families require specialized parental involvement intervention.
3. Program weights fund programs designed to address individual student academic needs. A weight of 0.15 is included for students who score Below Basic on PACT mathematics, English language arts or both to guarantee that the students receive additional tutoring, additional hours of instruction in summer school, extended school year, etc. Students who are classified as gifted and talented either academically or artistically would receive funds for services provided included IB and AP courses in the high school with a weight of 0.15. And, young adults aged 17 to 21 who are pursuing a diploma or GED through adult education or other means but are no longer part of the regular school setting would be funded at a weight of 0.20. The model would recommend that adult education for individuals over age 21 would be provided through the technical college system and not through public schools.

One change proposed in the weights in 2007 is a revision to the weight for non-English speaking or Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. In prior EOC models a weight of .12 was assigned to generate additional funds for English language instruction to LEP students. The .12 weight was based on state appropriation levels in North Carolina. An August 2007 report by the Federation for American Immigration Reform provided additional information to the EOC staff. This report documented that states are funding instruction for LEP students that range from \$290 per student in Idaho to \$711 per student in Tennessee.² “In the case of Tennessee, the reported local share of the funding program

² Jack Martin, “Limited English Proficiency Enrollment and Rapidly Rising Costs,” Federation for American Immigration Reform, www.fairus.org (August 2007).

amounts to an additional expenditure of \$487 per LEP enrollee.”³ In sum, the state of Tennessee has documented a cost of approximately \$1,200 per LEP student. In comparison to South Carolina which had an LEP enrollment between 2003 and 2005 of 12,096, Tennessee during the same period had a LEP enrollment of 17,887.⁴ Comparing the \$1,200 incremental cost of serving LEP students to the revised base student cost of \$5,606 yields a weight of 0.20 for LEP students.

This year the EOC has projected the total number of weighted pupil units that the state would fund under this revised funding system.

Table A

Classifications	Weights	WPU⁵s
K-5	1.0	268,489
6-8	1.0	138,731
9-12	1.0	77,105
Disabilities	Vary by disability – same as those used in EFA	178,239
Homebound	1.0	2,449
Vocational	1.2	118,676
TOTAL General Education WPU⁵s		783,689
Poverty (K-12)	.20	86,703
Non-English Speaking	.20	4,937
TOTAL Compensatory WPU⁵s		91,640
Gifted and talented (3-12)	.15	15,358
Remediation	.15	16,451
Adult Education 17 to 21 year-olds	.20	3,881
TOTAL Program WPU⁵s		35,690
ALL WPU⁵s		911,020

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Rounded to nearest whole number.

The total cost to fund the EOC model in 2007 is \$5,107,178,120. The cost is determined by multiplying the base student cost of \$5,606 by the total number of weighted pupil units, 911,020.

General Education Weights	\$4,393,359,401
Compensatory Weights	\$513,736,603
Program Weights	\$200,080,382
TOTAL	\$5,107,176,386

Comparing existing state and local revenues with the projected cost, the analysis reveals that based on Fiscal Year 2007-08 appropriations and tax projections, the state is allocating \$3,066,605,163 for public schools. This figure includes general fund, EIA and lottery appropriations to school districts. It does not include funds for EAA technical assistance, textbook purchases, assessment and school bus transportation. It also does not include the Homestead Exemption Fund payments to districts that total an estimated \$518,115,149 this year.

For comparison purposes, in Fiscal Year 2005-06 school districts received revenues from the following sources. Excluded are intergovernmental revenues totaling \$38,914,520. ⁶

Source	Fiscal Year 2005-06 District Revenues⁷
State	\$2,919,496,435
Local	\$2,962,120,323
Federal	\$676,912,986
Other ⁸	<u>\$2,784,775,483</u>
TOTAL	\$9,343,350,277

Using FY06 district revenues, the combined revenues from state and local sources alone exceed the total cost of the EOC funding model. However, it should be noted that local funds provide programs and initiatives that are not addressed by the EOC funding model and are implemented at the discretion of local school districts.

In 2006 the EOC recommended that the general education costs be funded through the EFA or by the state as so determined by the General Assembly. The EOC maintained that the compensatory and performance weights could be fully funded through the Education Improvement Act revenues if the general fund absorbed the costs of some programs currently funded in the EIA, primarily, the EAA technical assistance and assessment programs, four-year-old kindergarten and the arts curriculum grants.

⁶ South Carolina Department of Education,
http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/finance/documents/dstrev06_000.xls.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ "Other" includes sales from bonds and transfers.

Summary of Updates to EOC Funding Model in 2007

1. The base student cost was increased from \$5,311 to \$5,606
2. All general education weights for “regular” students become 1.0 weights
3. The weight for services for Non-English Speaking or Limited English Proficient (LEP) students increased from 0.12 to 0.20 to reflect most recent expenditure data from other states

Additional Analysis

This year the staff analyzed alternative ways to calculate the base student cost using various district and school enrollments. These three district and school enrollment models reflect the following models:

1. State Average Model – This model updates the average district and school enrollment amounts using the 2006 annual school and district report cards.
2. Stable Districts Model – Forty-eight school districts in South Carolina have earned absolute performance ratings of Average, Good or Excellent across the six years in which schools have been rated. The mean district and school enrollments for these 48 districts were used to compute a revised base student cost.
3. Exemplary Districts Model – Seven of the state’s 85 school districts have earned absolute performance ratings of Average, Good or Excellent and have had consistent improvement ratings of Below Average, Average, Good or Excellent between 2001 and 2006.⁹ The average district and school enrollments for these seven districts were used to compute a revised base student cost.

The following table summarizes the results of this analysis across the three models.

⁹ An improvement rating of Below Average signifies no change in performance.

Table B

	District Cost	High	Middle	Elementary	Base Student Cost¹⁰
EOC Traditional Model (2007)	\$1,704.96	\$3,901.24	\$3,821.11	\$3,886.77	\$5,606
Weightings		1.00	1.00	1.00	
Enrollment	7,500	900	750	500	
State Average Model	\$1,694.16	\$3,860.74	\$3,963.09	\$3,762.48	\$5,457
n=85					
Weightings		1.02	1.04	1.00	
Enrollment	8,180	978	616	518	
Stable Districts Model	\$1,670.63	\$3,801.71	\$3,881.05	\$3,488.55	\$5,159
n=48					
Weightings		1.06	1.08	1.00	
Enrollment	10,223	1,120	687	563	
Exemplary Model	\$1,669.03	\$3,738.21	\$3,819.04	\$3,532.45	\$5,201
n=7					
Weightings		1.04	1.06	1.00	
Enrollment	12,476	1,374	752	555	

As the above table reflects, the base student cost using these four models ranges from \$5,159 to \$5,606 or approximately 8%. The relative weights between elementary, middle and high schools vary with the alternative models. Enrollment patterns in schools are relatively consistent across the models.

¹⁰ Rounded up to the nearest whole dollar.

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 Prevents any class from having more than 35 students except for students with disabilities Student Teacher Ratio: Grade 6 ELA and Math, 30:1 and all other subjects, 35:1 Grades 7-8, 35:1	Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Divide school enrollment by 21 to yield number of teachers needed. Round to the nearest .5 teachers.	\$45,479	36	\$2,079,040.00	\$2,772.05
Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.	Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.		3.5		
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers	Currently, the cost of a class earning an equivalent of three graduate hours is \$600. FY06 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$297 per pupil for professional development and training. The average would be approximately \$450..		39.5	\$17,775.00	\$23.70
Proviso 1A.33. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$250 per teacher for supplies. Proviso 1A.70. increased the amount from \$250 to \$275 using non-recurring funds.	\$275 x Total Teachers		39.5	\$10,862.50	\$14.48

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of inservice training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$45,479, a teacher is compensated at \$239.36 per day. Including fringe benefits, the daily cost is \$306.38 per teacher. With rounding, five days per teacher costs \$1,532.		39.5	\$60,514.00	\$80.69
Regulation 43-205 one principal with an enrollment of 250 students or more	1.0 Principal	\$81,501		\$104,321.28	\$139.10
Regulation 43-205 an assistant principal or curriculum coordinator in schools over 500 students	1.0 Assistant Principal	\$64,595		\$82,681.60	\$110.24
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$25,647		\$32,828.16	\$43.77
	1.0 Attendance Clerk/Bookkeeper	\$25,246		\$32,314.88	\$43.09
Section 59-59-100 requires one guidance counselor for every 300 students in middle school;	Guidance Counselors	\$51,130	2.5	\$163,616.00	\$218.15
Regulation 43-205 Schools having an enrollment of 750 or more must employ 2 full time media specialists	2.0 Media Specialists	\$50,156		\$128,399.36	\$171.20
Section 59-66-20 School Resource Officers	Original allocation was \$20,500;however, program no longer has separate appropriation; Costs based on salary of midpoint of band range for a Law Enforcement Officer I of \$23,918 to \$44,251.	\$34,085		\$43,628.80	\$58.17
Section 59-59-100 one career specialist in every middle school beginning with the 2006-07 school year.	1.0 Career Specialist (Based on salary that is being funded in FY08)	\$40,747		\$52,156.16	\$69.54
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools			\$18,750.00	\$25.00

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 5-7-12 and Provisos 1A.61 Middle School Initiative	Provides funds to be used for school resource officer, counselor or nurse in middle schools containing 7th grade. Total appropriation of \$4,937,500 is divided by 161,607, the 135th day ADM for grades 6 through 8 in 2006-07, to yield \$30.55 per pupil.			\$22,912.50	\$30.55
Section 59-18-310 statewide formative assessment program for students	According to the fiscal impact statement of H.4328 (Act 254), the revisions to the statewide testing system would require funding of formative assessments of \$9 per student in grades K-12			\$6,750.00	\$9.00
Proviso 1AA.7. 6-8 Lottery Enhancement Funds, Grades 6-8 Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies Program	Currently, lottery funds for 6-8 enhancement are allocated based on the sum of \$5 times the number of non-free and reduced price lunch/Medicaid eligible students and \$15 times the number of free/reduced price lunch/Medicaid eligible students. This model would allocate the \$2.0 million currently allocated for middle schools across 161,607 students in middle schools, per 2006-07 135th count for resulting in a \$12.38 per pupil.			\$9,285.00	\$12.38
Section 59-18-500 refer to summer school as part of a student's academic plan; Re Regulation 43-240; and Proviso 1A.52.	Program weights for students needing remediation or identified as gifted and/or talented both artistically and academically are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues. AP and IB classes would be included. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				
Section 59-139-10 and Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 6-8					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 and Proviso 1A.3 Gifted and Talented Program					
Total for Middle School					\$3,821.11

Salary* -- Teacher salaries based on 2007-08 General Appropriation Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of *Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2006-07* published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
<p>Regulation 43-205: Average student teacher ratio not to exceed 28:1 with a district maintaining an average student-teacher ratio of 21:1 in reading and math in grades one through three.</p> <p>Maximum Student to Teacher Ratios by grade: Prekindergarten, 20:1 Grades K-3, 30:1 Grades 4-5 ELA and Math, 30:1 Grades 4-5 All other subjects, 35:1 Section 59-35-10 Requires full-day kindergarten unless parents exempt child Proviso 1A.54. Class size reduction in grades 1 to 3 is 15:1</p>	<p>Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Divide school enrollment by 21 to yield number of teachers needed. Round to the nearest .5 teachers.</p>	\$45,479	24	\$1,397,114.88	\$2,794.23
<p>Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.</p>	<p>Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.</p>		2		
<p>Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers</p>	<p>Currently, the cost of a class earning an equivalent of three graduate hours is \$600. FY06 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$297 per pupil for professional development and training. The average would be approximately \$450..</p>		26	\$11,700.00	\$23.40

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Proviso 1A.33. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$250 per teacher for supplies. Proviso 1A.70. increased the amount from \$250 to \$275 using non-recurring funds.	\$275 x Total Teachers		26	\$7,150.00	\$14.30
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of inservice training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$45,479, a teacher is compensated at \$239.36 per day. Including fringe benefits, the daily cost is \$306.38 per teacher. With rounding, five days per teacher costs \$1,532.		26	\$39,832.00	\$79.66
Regulation 43-205 One principal for school with at least 375 students	1.0 Principal	\$77,214		\$98,833.92	\$197.67
Regulation 43-205 requires each school with an enrollment of 600 or more students to be staffed with at least one full-time assistant principal	Enrollment is less than 600; therefore, none is required.				
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$25,647		\$32,828.16	\$65.66
	1.0 Attendance clerk/bookkeeper	\$25,246		\$32,314.88	\$64.63
Regulation 43-205 requires schools with an enrollment of 400 or more to employ a full-time media specialist	1.0 Library Media Specialist	\$50,156		\$64,199.68	\$128.40
Regulation 43-205 requires schools with an enrollment of 501 or more to employ one full time certified counselor.	1.0 Guidance Counselor	\$51,130		\$65,446.40	\$130.89
Section 59-10-210 Beginning school year 2007-08, one nurse in every elementary school	1.0 Nurse	\$33,883		\$43,370.24	\$86.74

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Sections 59-10-10 and 59-10-20 of the Students Health and Fitness Act of 2005 and Provisos 1.70 and 1.80 require each student to have 50 minutes a week in PE in a class not to exceed 28 students per teacher; 59-10-20 requires one PE teacher for every 700 elementary students in FY07, one to 600 in FY08 and one to 500 in FY09. Section 59-210-40 requires professional development for PE teachers	1.0 PE Teacher	\$45,479		\$58,213.12	\$116.43
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools			\$12,500.00	\$25.00
Section 59-1-525; Provisos 1AA.3. and 1AA.7. Education Lottery Appropriations: K-5 Enhancement Program	Funds are currently allocated accordingly: \$50,000 per district plus \$100 per K-5 student for enhancements. For formative assessments, allocation of \$2000 plus \$5 per K-5 student; for a poverty index, \$3 per student times the district poverty index squared with a maximum of \$100,000; \$2000 per school rated as Unsatisfactory in December 2006. Base allocation for social studies of \$2,000 plus \$1 per student; Base allocation of \$50,000 for 21 ELA coaches in Phase 3 and \$30,000 for 20 coaches in Phase 4; math and science coaches based on applications awarding \$31,200 for 67 coaches; and \$30,000 for 36 technology coaches. In FY08, a total of \$47,614,527 was allocated for K-5 students. The FY06-07 135th day counts for students in grades K-5 totaled 315,836. Dividing \$47,614,527 by 315,836 yields a per pupil allocation of \$150.76.			\$75,380.00	\$150.76

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED		COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-18-310 formative assessment for students	According to the fiscal impact statement of H.4328 (Act 254), the revisions to the statewide testing system would require funding of formative assessments of \$9 per student in grades K-12			\$4,500.00	\$9.00
59-139-10 & Regulation 43-267 Early Childhood Intervention (Act 135) applies to grades 1-3	Compensatory weights for students in poverty and for students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				
59-139-10 & Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 4-5	Performance weights for students needing remediation and students identified and served as gifted and/or talented both artistically are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				
59-18-500 (B-D), Regulation 43-240 & Proviso 1.57 Summer Schools					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 & Proviso 1A.4: Gifted and talented program incorporates ratio of 1:20 for special school model and 1:15 for resource model					
Total for Elementary School					\$3,886.77
OTHER PRE-K Programs:	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Chapter 139 of Title 59, Regulation 43-264 and Proviso 1A.13 Half-day program for four-year olds. Allocations based on the number of kindergarten children who are eligible for free and reduced lunch; however, no district receives less than 90 percent of the amount it received in the prior fiscal year.	In FY2006-07, \$21,532,678 in EIA funds were allocated to an estimated 21,407 four-year-olds for a per child allocation of \$1,005.87				\$1,005.87
Proviso 1.75. SC Child Development Education Pilot Program	In the second year of the pilot program, the funded cost per child is \$3,931				\$3,931.00

Section 59-36-50 and Proviso 1.9 services for preschoolers with disabilities	1995 Joint Committee to Study Formula Funding in Education Programs recommended \$3,009 per student. In FY2006-07, 13,549 preschoolers with disabilities were funded at \$3,973,584. The population served is 4.33% of the total state enrollment in elementary schools.			\$65,144.85	\$130.29
--	--	--	--	--------------------	-----------------

Salary* -- Teacher salaries based on 2007-08 General Appropriation Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of *Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2006-07* published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the

Classifications	2003-04 ADM	2004-05 ADM	2005-06 ADM	2006-07 ADM	Current Weights	Revised Weights
Kindergarten	41,917.95	43,599.35	45,517.36	46,422.29	1.30	1.00
Primary (1-3)	123,924.54	125,618.86	129,664.55	135,459.10	1.24	1.00
Elementary (4-8)					1.00	
Elementary (4-5)	87,613.20	86,074.01	85,553.88	86,607.79		1.00
Middle (6-8)	138,876.77	141,805.01	140,374.02	138,730.68		1.00
High School (9-12)	78,732.81	78,349.85	78,982.25	77,104.74	1.25	1.00
Educable Mentally Handicapped	8,498.06	7,591.90	6,941.44	6,084.15	1.74	
Learning Disabled	44,333.09	45,117.04	45,887.10	45,703.88	1.74	
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	2,627.96	2,541.79	2,556.13	2,527.39	2.04	
Emotionally Handicapped	5,462.81	5,233.78	4,698.84	4,391.67	2.04	
Orthopedically Handicapped	1,164.15	984.43	998.07	976.05	2.04	
Visually Handicapped	613.60	581.33	566.52	588.10	2.57	
Hearing Handicapped	1,248.20	1,201.61	1,191.43	1,170.44	2.57	
Speech Handicapped	34,913.37	34,422.39	33,851.16	32,481.93	1.90	
Homebound	2,299.90	2,376.73	2,400.02	2,449.23	2.10	1.00
Autism	1,404.82	1,600.83	1,911.24	2,251.67	2.57	
Vocational 1	57,601.87	57,297.61	61,227.21	63,700.01	1.29	
Vocational 2	21,476.62	22,040.87	22,094.12	23,032.79	1.29	
Vocational 3	11,252.46	11,230.41	10,680.29	12,163.76	1.29	
Career and Technology (Combine Vocational 1, 2 and 3)	90,050.00	90,568.89	94,001.62	98,896.56		1.20
Total General Education WPU s						
Additional Classifications:						
<i>Compensatory:</i>						
Poverty (K-12)			417,251.84	433,517.46		0.20
Non-English Speaking	10,984.00	16,049.00	27,000.00	24,685.00		0.20
Total Compensatory WPU s						
<i>Program:</i>						
Gifted and Talented (3-12)	97,162.00	90,510.00	94,021.00	102,387.00	0.30	0.15
Remediation			112,555.00	109,673.00	0.114	0.15
Adult Education 17-21 Population	16,442.00	15,693.00	18,264.00	19,407.00		0.20
Total Performance WPU s						
GRAND TOTAL WPU s						

* All counts are based upon the 2006-07 actual ADM counts or upon the most recent data provided by the South Carolina Education.

NOTE: All classifications and ADMs in bold are unduplicated counts.

EXPLANATION OF CLASSIFICATIONS AND CHANGES OVER THE 2003 MODE

Adult Education: The funds would target young people who are between the ages of 17 and 21 and have not obtained a high school diploma. The allocation would equal \$1,000 per student for a minimum of 300 hours of attendance or the successful completion of a high school credential during the school year.

Remediation: In 2006 approximately 109,673 students in grades three through eight scored Below Basic on PACT I and II. The weighting of .114, which is also the current weighting for academic assistance in the EFA, would provide an additional \$114 per student to provide remediation services to these students.

Poverty: The original EOC funding models had separate line items for prevention and remediation. Prevention was for students in grades K-3 who were eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program and/or Medicaid. Remediation was for students in grades 3-8 who had scored Below Basic on one or more sections of PACT. The 2006 EOC funding model combines the two into a single line item for all students in grades K-12 who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch and/or Medicaid. The model recognizes the chronic impact of poverty and assists students who score Below Basic to improve and students who score at or above to maintain academic achievement. According to the 2006 district report cards, 63.58% of the 135-day ADM for students in kindergarten, elementary, middle and high school in South Carolina were eligible for the free and reduced price lunch and/or Medicaid.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL): An August 2007 report from the Federation for American Immigration Reform documents that state expenditures for English language instruction programs in public schools range from \$290 per student in Idaho to \$711 per student in Tennessee. In the case of Tennessee, the local funding program is documented at an additional \$487 per enrollee. The total amount of state and local expenditures for English language instruction is approximately \$1,200 per student. The state of North Carolina which funds LEP with state appropriations approximately \$1,200 per student. The state of North Carolina created a Joint Legislative Study Committee on Public School Funding Formula to review funding of various programs including the Limited English Proficiency Program. Using the Tennessee model of \$1,200 per student, the revised LEP weight for FY 2007 is 0.20.

Career Exploration: Due to passage of the Education and Economic Development Act of 2005, the costs associated with career specialists and guidance counselors are included in the base student costs rather than through a separate weight.

Gifted and Talented (G&T): In FY 2006-07, there were 70,809 Gifted and Talented Academic Students and 9,150 Gifted and Talented Artistic students. Based upon the allocation of G&T funds in FY07 which totaled \$33,397,533, districts received approximately \$417.68 per student served in G&T. In addition, 22,428 students who took one or more AP tests.

2007 Revised WPU's
46,422.29
135,459.10
86,607.79
138,730.68
77,104.74
10,586.42
79,524.75
5,155.88
8,959.01
1,991.14
1,511.42
3,008.03
61,715.67
2,449.23
5,786.79
118,675.87
783,689
86,703.49
4,937.00
91,640
15,358.05
16,450.95
3,881.40
35,690
911,020

a Department of

L

ined a high
cessful

ELA, Math or
dditional funds

targeted to
n targeted
el allocates
erty weighting
score Basic or
or all students
rch program

t by the
grams in public
l share of the
in Tennessee is
ely has now
is including the
SC would be

d with hiring
ighting.

Gifted and
ived

FY2007-08 Appropriation *	General Fund	EIA	Lottery	Other
Act 135 - Academic Assistance (K-3)		\$66,834,557		
Act 135 - Academic Assistance (4-12)		\$49,402,019		
Adult Education		\$12,677,703		
Advanced Placement		\$3,970,000		
Alternative Schools		\$11,688,777		
APT/ADEPT	\$2,045,311			
Career Specialists	\$21,922,284			
Competitive Teacher Grants		\$1,287,044		
Credits for High School Diploma		\$23,632,801		
Critical Teaching Needs		\$352,911		
Education Finance Act	\$1,506,721,766			
Employer Contributions	\$463,328,893			
Gifted and Talented - Academic		\$30,451,890		
Gifted and Talented - Artistic		\$4,302,530		
Governor's Institute of Reading		\$1,312,874		
High Schools that Work	\$1,780,000	\$1,000,000		
Jr. Scholars Program		\$51,558		
Lunch Program	\$413,606			
Middle School Initiative		\$4,937,500		
CATE Equipment	\$4,739,548	\$3,963,520		
National Board Certification	\$6,061,304	\$45,824,534		
Nurse Program	\$597,562			
Parenting/Family Literacy		\$5,605,803		
Principal Salary Supplement		\$3,098,123		
Professional Development		\$6,111,100		
Professional Development -NSF		\$2,900,382		
Reduce Class Size		\$35,047,429		
Retiree Insurance	\$77,155,701			
SAT Improvement	\$239,571			
Student Health and Fitness (Nurses)	\$25,000,000			
Physical Education Teacher Ratio	\$5,688,911			
Summer School		\$30,750,000		
Teacher Salary Supplement		\$79,290,057		
Teacher Supplies		\$12,750,000		
Teachers Salary Supplement Fringe		\$16,024,520		
Tech Prep - School to Work		\$4,064,483		
Technology		\$13,683,697		
Young Adult Education	\$3,200,000	\$1,600,000		
SUBTOTAL:	\$2,118,894,457	\$472,615,812		

FY2007-08 Appropriation *	General Fund	EIA	Lottery	
Transportation:				
School Bus Driver Salary & Fringe	\$38,136,543			
Bus Drivers Workers Compensation	\$3,063,333			
Contract Drivers	\$378,531			
Bus Drivers Aide	\$159,670			
EAA- Transportation	\$4,000,000			
SUBTOTAL:	\$45,738,077			
OTHER:				
K-5 Reading, Math, Science & Social Studies			\$44,303,700	
6-8 Reading, Math, Science & Social Studies			\$2,000,000	
High School Reading Initiative	\$1,000,000			
SUBTOTALS:	\$1,000,000		\$46,303,700	
TOTAL STATE ALLOCATIONS:				
Other State Revenue in Lieu of Taxes for FY2006				
Local Property Tax Relief				\$244,802,371
Homestead Exemption				\$85,044,211
Merchants Inventory Tax				\$19,888,040
Manufacturer's Deprec Reimbursement				\$23,008,509
Other State Property Tax Revenue				\$9,354,986
SUBTOTAL:				\$382,098,117
TOTAL:	\$2,165,632,534	\$472,615,812	\$46,303,700	\$382,098,117
OTHER:				
Four-Year-Old Early Childhood		\$21,032,678		
Transportation Four-Year-Olds		\$450,776		
Preschool Children with Disabilities		\$3,855,017		
Early Intervention Preschoolers		\$3,973,584		
Arts Curricula		\$1,597,584		
Children's Education Endowment Fund				\$10,300,000

* Sources: Fiscal Year 2007-08 General Appropriation Act, http://www.myschools.com/offices/finance/budget_inform
District Revenues, State Department of Education. All attempts were made to reflect only allocations to the eight-five sc
excluding funds retained by SDE for administration, reallocated by provisos, or expended on special school districts, col
vocational centers..

TOTAL
\$66,834,557
\$49,402,019
\$12,677,703
\$3,970,000
\$11,688,777
\$2,045,311
\$1,287,044
\$23,632,801
\$352,911
\$1,506,721,766
\$463,328,893
\$30,451,890
\$4,302,530
\$1,312,874
\$2,780,000
\$413,606
\$4,937,500
\$8,703,068
\$51,885,838
\$597,562
\$5,605,803
\$3,098,123
\$6,111,100
\$2,900,382
\$35,047,429
\$77,155,701
\$239,571
\$30,750,000
\$79,290,057
\$12,750,000
\$16,024,520
\$4,064,483
\$13,683,697
\$4,800,000
\$2,591,510,269

TOTAL
\$38,136,543
\$378,531
\$159,670
\$45,738,077
\$44,303,700
\$2,000,000
\$1,000,000
\$47,303,700
\$2,684,552,046
\$244,802,371
\$85,044,211
\$19,888,040
\$23,008,509
\$9,354,986
\$382,098,117
\$3,066,650,163
\$21,032,678
\$450,776
\$3,855,017
\$3,973,584
\$1,597,584
\$10,300,000

ation and FY2004-05
chool districts by
ounty boards, and